



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

certain devices that the defendants could control their currents so as not to interfere with the use of complainant's instruments, the law might treat their failure to adopt such measures as negligence in the use of their franchise and enjoin them." See also *Peoria Water Works Co. v. Peoria Ry. Co.*, 181 Fed. 990, 9 MICH. L. REV. 355. But negligence, unskillfulness, and malice, in the operation of the railway were not charged in the principal case, nor was it shown how the alleged nuisance could be corrected.

EQUITY—INJUNCTION AGAINST UNFAIR COMPETITION.—Plaintiff and defendant were both manufacturers of vacuum cleaners. Defendant claimed to own a patent which covered all such machines, and had persisted in writing letters to customers of plaintiff threatening suits. Plaintiff had invited defendant to bring suit for infringement of the patent so that the matter might be determined, but defendant had not pressed his claim, and had continued to write letters to the plaintiff's customers. Plaintiff seeks injunction. *Held*, injunction granted. *Electric Renovator Mfg. Co. v. Vacuum Cleaner Co. et al*, (1911) 189 Fed. 754.

A court of equity will enjoin unfair competition if the injured party does not have an adequate remedy at law. *Gilly v. Hirsh*, 122 La. 966; *Halstead v. Houston*, 111 Fed. 376. That the question whether or not the sending out of letters threatening suit for the infringement of patents when the claims of the writer have not been established, is within the rule has previously been before the courts. *Farquhar Co. Ltd. v. Nat. Har. Co.*, 102 Fed. 714; *Adriance, Platt & Co. v. Nat. Har. Co.*, 121 Fed. 827. Both of these cases held that the defendant's acts constituted unfair competition and that equity would enjoin them. The principal case is in accord with the two cases last cited and strengthens the opinions there laid down. It holds that even where the defendant has a suit pending for the purpose of determining his claim to the exclusive manufacturing right under his patent, he can not write threatening letters to plaintiff's customers.

FISHERY—IN GROSS OR APPURTENANT.—Complainant, a canal company, was incorporated under an act of Parliament which provided that "the owner and owners of all and every manor and manors through which the said intended cut or canal shall be made, shall have and be entitled to the sole, several and exclusive right of fishery of and in so much of the said cut or canal * * * as shall be made over, through * * * or within his, her or their, manor or manors respectively." In 1845 land through which the canal was made was granted to the Earl of Shrewsbury, together with all "tolls, duties, fisheries, profits * * * respectively belonging or in any way appertaining" thereto. In 1910 the Earl of Shrewsbury granted to an angling club of which the defendant is a member, the exclusive right to fish for and take away fish from that part of the canal within lessor's said land. The canal company seeks to enjoin the exercise of this grant. *Held*: the right, being one to take fish without stint, and without relation to the needs of the land, was not a right appurtenant, or capable of being made appurtenant, to the land, but a right in gross, and not capable of passing under the general words of the deed of 1845. *Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal Navigation v. Bradley* [1912] 1 Ch. 91.